

**REMARKS**

Claims 2, 4-10, and 12-22 are pending. Claims 1, 3 and 11 have been canceled. Claims 12-22 are new. Claims 6 and 7 have been withdrawn. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 2, 4, 5 and 8-11 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art of Fig. 11 in view of Vaughan *et al.* Claim 11 has been canceled and thus will not be discussed. As for claims 2, 4, 5 and 8-10, the applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn for the reasons that follow.

Claim 10 has been converted to an independent claim and now includes the limitations of canceled claim 11. Further, claim 10 now recites that the single component fixes the positions of the trim and the glass run to keep the trim in contact with the glass run.

The prior art of Fig. 11 shows an integral member that includes both a glass run and a trim. The office action states that it would have been obvious to have made the trim of Fig. 11 of the present application into a separate member as taught by Vaughn *et al.* However, it would not have been obvious to combine Fig. 11 with the Vaughn apparatus. The glass run and trim strip of Fig. 11 is less expensive to make and install as compared to a separate glass run and trim strip because the strip of Fig. 11 involves only one part. The examiner states that the reason for combining these structures is that "the provision of a separate trim enables the sealing assembly to accommodate greater stamping irregularities." However, there is no indication that this is true.

Stamping irregularities would be problematic regardless of whether the trim and glass run are integral or separate. On the other hand, it is clear that forming two separate strips, as opposed to a single strip, increases costs and labor. Using a separate trim and glass run is counterintuitive, especially when a goal is to reduce the cost of labor and to improve installation efficiency.

The Vaughn *et al.* patent is primarily concerned with installation efficiency. Vaughn *et al.* disclose a subassembly that can be quickly installed without having to fit a glass run into a channel. See col. 2, lines 9-11. The structure of Fig. 11, on the other hand, involves fitting a glass run into a channel, the very thing that Vaughn *et al.* wish to avoid. Moreover, the combination set forth by the examiner involves not only fitting a glass run into a channel but also fitting a trim strip onto a flange. Therefore, the combination set forth in the office action requires more labor and parts than either the structure of Fig. 11 or the Vaughn *et al.* structure alone. Thus, the combination violates the teachings of Vaughn *et al.* regarding speed and efficiency during installation, and the combination would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

One reason that the applicant has for using a separate trim and glass run is that, when an integral glass run and trim strip is used and when it is desired that the trim and the glass run have different radiuses in a corner of a window, the corner is complicated, and it is difficult to form an integral trim and glass run that fits the corner properly. This is explained in detail in the Background section of the application. See, in particular, page 3, line 10 to the end of the Background section. This problem is not recognized by the patent to Vaughn *et al.* It appears that the glass run and the trim strip of the Vaughn *et al.* device do not encounter any corners,

although there is a large-radius bend in their path. Corners are not even discussed by Vaughn *et al.* Thus, the Vaughn *et al.* patent is not solving the same or a similar problem, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not have looked to the patent to Vaughn *et al.* when faced with the problems that exist with the prior art of Fig. 11.

Claims 2 and 4-9 depend on claim 10 and are considered to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to claim 10. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2, 4, 5, and 8-10 be withdrawn.

Claims 12-22 are new. Claims 12-17 and 20-22 are readable on the elected species. Claims 18 and 19, which correspond to claims 6 and 7, are readable on a non-elected species.

Claims 12 and 13 depend, directly or indirectly, on claim 10. Therefore, claims 12 and 13 are considered to be patentable for the reasons given above for the patentability of claim 10. In addition, claim 12 recites that the trim is an extrusion that is merely bent to fit a corner of the attachment structure, and the glass run includes a molded corner part that corresponds to the corner. This feature is illustrated in Fig. 3. Neither Vaughn *et al.* nor the structure of Fig. 11 includes such a structure; thus, the combination of Fig. 11 and Vaughn *et al.* fails to include such a structure.

Claim 13 recites that an opening is formed between the trim and the glass run in the corner due to a difference in radius of curvature between the trim and the glass run, and the opening is covered with a shielding plate located outside of a side wall of the trim. This feature is shown in Fig. 3 and is described near the middle of page 15 of the substitute specification.

Neither Vaughn *et al.* nor the structure of Fig. 11 includes such a structure; thus, the combination of Fig. 11 and Vaughn *et al.* fails to include such a structure.


Claim 14 is a new independent claim, which is similar but not identical to claim 10.

Claim 14 and its dependents are considered to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to claim 10. That is, it would not have been obvious to combine the structure of Fig. 11 with that of the patent to Vaughn *et al.*

In view of the foregoing, the applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. A timely notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If questions relating to patentability remain, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone.

Please charge any unforeseen fees that may be due to Deposit Account No. 50-1147.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James E. Barlow  
Reg. No. 32,377

Posz Law Group, PLC  
11250 Roger Bacon Drive, Suite 10  
Reston, VA 20190  
Phone 703-707-9110  
Fax 703-707-9112  
Customer No. 23400